

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Gabrielli Flores Moraes, Jéssica Bittencourt, Priscilla SENA SOUZA LUZ CAMPOS, Cristiane BACCIN BENDO, Izabella BARBOSA FERNANDES¹, Ananda Tatielle da SILVA VAL:

Your submission Frequency and factors associated with endodontic treatment in deciduous teeth: a study conducted at a Brazilian university to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected. Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Comments

Comments to the Author

General Comments

This manuscript reports a retrospective cross-sectional study based on dental records from a public Brazilian university, addressing the frequency of endodontic

treatment in primary teeth and associated factors. The topic is clinically and epidemiologically relevant. However, several aspects require clarification and methodological refinement to improve transparency, reproducibility, and interpretation of the findings.

Abstract

The abstract should specify which types of endodontic procedures were included (e.g., pulpotomy, pulpectomy, other pulp therapies) to allow proper interpretation of the outcome.

Introduction

Traumatic dental injuries, an important indication for endodontic treatment in primary teeth, are not mentioned and should be briefly addressed.

A more structured presentation of socioeconomic, behavioral, and access-related determinants associated with severe dental outcomes would strengthen the rationale.

The introduction should more explicitly state the lack of studies using clinical records to assess the frequency and associated factors of endodontic treatment in primary teeth, particularly in Brazilian public university settings. The relevance of the university-based clinical setting should be better justified, especially regarding care for socially vulnerable populations and complex cases. Additional references are encouraged.

Methods

The manuscript does not mention adherence to the STROBE checklist, which is recommended for observational studies. The authors should clarify whether STROBE was followed and consider including the checklist as supplementary material.

The exclusion of trauma-related endodontic cases, treated in a separate extension program, should be more clearly acknowledged as a potential source of selection bias, and its impact on the estimated frequency should be emphasized.

The rationale for the age categorization (2–7 years vs. >7 years) should be clearly explained, as this grouping combines preschool and school-aged children and may affect interpretation.

The authors should clarify the training and expertise of the researchers responsible for data extraction. It should also be specified how data were recorded (e.g., standardized form, electronic database, spreadsheet) to ensure consistency and

reduce information bias.

Results

This section should include a detailed characterization of the endodontic treatments performed, specifying the distribution of conventional instrumental and non-instrumental techniques. The prevalence of endodontic treatment should also be reported according to tooth type (anterior vs. posterior primary teeth), given its clinical relevance.

Discussion

The large sample loss (606 of 1,478 records excluded) requires a clearer explanation, including which variables were missing and how this may have influenced prevalence estimates and associations.

Conclusion

The conclusion should briefly highlight the clinical and public health implications, particularly regarding early dental care and prevention of advanced caries.
